

Religious Inquirer.

COME NOW, AND LET US REASON TOGETHER.—ISAIAH I. 18.

EDITED BY REV. RICHARD CARRIQUE.—HARTFORD, CONN. G. W. KAPPEL, PRINTER.

\$1 PER ANN. IN ADVANCE.]

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1821.

[VOL. I.—NO. IV.]

The following is from the Gospel Herald, of September 22, 1821, a paper published in NEW-YORK and edited by HENRY FITZ.

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD.

STATEMENT OF FACTS.

"For I beheld, and there was *no man*; even among *them*, and there was *no councillor*, that when I asked of them, **COULD ANSWER A WORD.** Behold, *they* are all *vanity*—*their works are NOTHING.*" Isa. xli. 28, 29.

On Friday, August 31st, a committee of two members from the Rev. Mr. Van Velsan's church, waited on me with a request, that I would meet their pastor, Mr. Van V. on the Monday following, at his church in Broome-street, at 7 o'clock, P. M. for the purpose of discussing the question of the *extent* of the *Atonement*, and defending the doctrine of the "*Restitution of all things*," against the attack which should be made at that time and place, by the Rev. gentleman aforesaid. I consented to meet him.—The time arrived. A tremendous hurricane raged, and the church was filled, notwithstanding the war of elements, the wreck of matter, and the crush of—buildings! A message arrived from Mr. Van V. informing the audience that, in consequence of the inclemency of the weather, and his own indisposition, he could not attend; and they accordingly dispersed. The committee called on me after the meeting was dismissed, and Friday evening, Sept. 7, was proposed. They agreed to consult Mr. Van V., and inform me of his acceptance or the contrary, during the following day. Not hearing from them, I called on Mr. Van V. on Wednesday, and he agreed to meet on Friday evening at 7 o'clock, at his church, &c. This arrangement was made known, and circulated, in an almost unaccountable manner, throughout the city, and in adjacent towns.

On Friday, at 1 o'clock, one of the committee called, and informed me that the evening previous the church had met, and a majority of the members decided that the house should not be opened for the discussion. He likewise stated, that "the Rev. Mr. Parkinson had sent word to them, and advised them not to have any thing to do with the Universalists," &c. We repaired to Mr. Van V. who said that he had no control over his people, and could not oblige them to open the house. He declared that he would meet me in any large convenient building which could be obtained, and publicly discuss the subject in question; and if no building convenient for the purpose could be procured, he would meet in the *open field*! I left him about 2 o'clock, P. M. and informed some of the friends of truth of the decision of the members of Mr. Van V.'s church, &c. They immediately applied for and obtained TAMMANY HALL for that evening, and a gentleman started immediately for Mr. Van V.'s house, to give him the necessary information. Mr. Van V. could not be found at his own house, nor at those of his friends, where it was said he had, in all probability retired. An effort was made by gentlemen from a distant town, (who had come to hear the discussion) about half past 6 o'clock to find him, and persuade him to meet at Tammany Hall that evening. Their search proved fruitless. In the mean time, an admirer of the Rev. Mr. Van V., in company with a believer in the restitution of all things, repaired to Tammany Hall, relinquished the Hall for that evening, and agreed for it for the Wednesday evening following, (the 12th inst.) the friend and advocate of Mr. Van V. pledging

himself that Mr. Van V. should appear (sickness accepted) with his moderator, &c. Understanding, about 7 o'clock, that a large concourse of people had assembled in Broome-st in front of Mr. Van V.'s church, I went there, and informed them of the decision of Mr. Van V.'s people, that the church should not be opened, &c. Likewise informed them, that the meeting would take place at Tammany Hall on the Wednesday following, &c. It is due our fellow-citizens to declare, that, notwithstanding the disappointment, good order and harmony prevailed throughout the crowd.

On Saturday morning I learned that Mr. Van V. had declined a *public discussion*. On the evening of that day I waited upon him, and received from his mouth a declaration, that he would not meet in *public* in any manner whatever. He likewise declared, that he would meet me in *private*, in company with *twelve* members of his church, and as many Universalists, and that the discussion might be made public, if a *majority* thought proper. A competent Stenographer had been engaged from the first, and it was generally understood, that the discussion should be published to the world.

On Tuesday evening (the 11th inst.) I called on Mr. Van V. for the purpose of making the necessary arrangements for a private discussion, and asking him if he would meet and discuss the subject in private, &c. received for answer, "*I will not have any thing to do with a Universalist.*"

Thus ends the word, repeatedly pledged, of a Calvinistic Clergyman! Like a ghost, it dissolved into thin air, and vanished! And we tell him, that had he been true to his appointment, his doctrine would have vanished also!

(To be Continued.)

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE INQUIRER.

Dr. Wood's Reply to Dr. Ware's Letters.

We have perused this publication, and while we admire the talents and candour of the Rev. Professor, we cannot but be surprised at the numerous concessions with which this volume abounds. Rather than surrender his favorite tenet, he appears to be willing to explain it away, till it amounts to merely nothing. This will be seen in his illustration of *depravity*. To support this doctrine, he has written nearly one hundred and fifty pages, but instead of defending the Calvinistic doctrine of depravity, he has studied to modify it in such a manner as to rid it of objections; and in so doing, he has reduced it nearly to the views of Unitarians. But what is the most remarkable is, that the Dr. attempts to prove the doctrine of depravity from the experience of mankind, and its appearance in early life. After labouring the point for considerable length, he sums up his arguments in the following language.

"I have now stated the leading considerations, which prove the depravity of man to be *native, natural, innate*. First—Moral depravity is as universal among men, as reason, memory, or the bodily senses, which are allowed by all to be natural. Second—Depravity shows itself very early; as early as could be expected, on the supposition that it is native; that is, at the earliest period of childhood to which our memory can reach with regard to ourselves, or in which children are able, by intelligible signs, to manifest their feelings to others. Third—The depravity of man cannot be traced to any calamity which befalls him, or to any change which takes place in his moral con-

stitution, subsequently to his birth. Fourth—Moral depravity, like other native affections or principles of the mind, is spontaneous in its operations, and hard to be eradicated. Fifth—We can predict concerning any human being, as soon as born, that if he live long enough to exhibit the character of a moral agent, he will certainly be a sinner; and this power of prediction must depend on a settled, uniform cause, a law of our nature.”—page 61.

This appears to be the sum total of his reasoning, aside from the scriptures, to support his favorite theory; or at least are his “leading considerations.” But does the Rev. Professor expect to support his hypothesis by arguments so feeble, so futile, so fallacious? Are these the “considerations,” by which he expects to confound his opponent, and convince an enlightened public? If these are his “leading considerations,” it requires no spirit of prophecy to predict his failure. These “considerations” prove the *moral purity* of mankind, as clearly as they prove moral depravity, and may be retorted upon him with full force. Thus: First—*Moral virtue* is as universal among men, as reason, memory, or the bodily senses, which are allowed by all to be natural. Second—Virtue shows itself very early; as early as could be expected, on the supposition that it is native; that is, at the earliest period of childhood to which our memory can reach in regard to ourselves, or in which children are able, by intelligible signs, to manifest it to others. Third—The virtue of man cannot be traced to any special influence, or to any change which takes place in his moral constitution, subsequently to his birth. Fourth—Moral purity, like other native affections or principles of the mind, is spontaneous in its operations, and hard to be eradicated. Fifth—We can predict concerning any human being, as soon as born, that if he live long enough to exhibit the character of a moral agent, he will certainly perform virtuous actions; and this power of prediction must depend on a settled, uniform cause, a law of our nature.

Thus do the Dr.'s. “leading considerations,” as conclusively prove that man is holy and pure by nature, as that he is possessed of a depraved nature by his birth. How can the Dr. deny the force of this reasoning? Virtuous actions are performed by men *universally*; they appear *early*; cannot be traced to any *change*; are *spontaneous*; and can be predicted with *certainty*. And how can all this be the case unless men inherit by nature a constitution free from moral defilement? Will the Dr. attribute all this virtue to the influence of the divine spirit? Then the divine influence is not restricted to a few, as the Dr. strenuously contends. Will it be said that the spirit is conferred upon all in a degree, but upon the elect in more copious effusions? Why then are these self-termed elect as prone to evil as other men? Thus it will be seen that the “leading considera-

tions” of our author prove too much for his purpose, and therefore prove nothing. *Nothing*, did I say, they prove the reverse for which they were intended, and defeat his own theory.

H—n.

FOR THE INQUIRER.

The following extracts are from the Unitarian Miscellany, No. 9, Vol. II. published at Baltimore, Sept. 1821, being a part of a letter to the Rev. Dr. Miller, of New-Jersey, who in an Ordination Sermon at Baltimore, charged Unitarians with preaching immorality, by saying that “all men, whatever be their character, will finally be saved, or annihilated,” and that this was “inculcated by unitarian preachers all over the world.”

It seems our Unitarian brethren wish to have mankind believe in the eternity of future punishment, and yet they do not wish it. See the extracts.

“The true state of the case is, then, that Unitarians as a *body universally* believe in the future punishment of the wicked. By a very large number the punishment has been considered eternal. By others it is supposed to be limited in duration.”

“But even admitting it to be the faith of any number, or a majority of Unitarians, that all men will finally be saved, why should they be selected as singular in this belief, and exposed to censure as if they maintained a doctrine, which has not been advocated by many pious men in all ages of the church.”

“Origen of old is well known to have preached this doctrine, and Augustine tells of certain divines who held it in his time. It was common in Germany before the reformation, especially among the Baptists; and since that period, it has been received by numerous persons in every sect of christians. It was countenanced by archbishop Tillotson, of whom Whiston remarks, that, “he chose rather to give up the veracity of God in these his threatenings, than to defend this eternity” of punishment. Both Dr. Bennett and bishop Burnet, in their respective treatises on the church of England, express a belief, that eternal death made no part of the sentence against Adam. The doctrine in question was maintained by bishop Newton, Dr. Rust, bishop of Dromore, Dr. T. Burnet, Dr. Cheyne, Mr. White, William Law, the pious and intellectual Hartly, and the equally pious Lavater, by Dr. Chauncey, Chevalier Ramsey, and numerous others, who have written with great ability and learning in explanation and defence of their views, and who, it is believed, were all Trinitarians.” After adding much more on this subject he subjoins by way of note the following.

“With the truth or falsehood of either of the doctrines I have at present no concern. The controversy on this subject is well known to rest on the meaning of a single Greek word and its derivative. The advocates for one doctrine affirm,

that the word signifies an eternal duration when applied to the punishment of the wicked ; while those on the other side maintain, that it should always be taken in a limited sense when thus applied. Hence the whole controversy becomes a matter of verbal criticism, and is one presumption against the doctrine of eternal misery—a doctrine of so much moment if true—that it should be left to so slender a defence ; and more especially, as the word is used in only *five* places in the New-Testament in the connexion with the punishment of sin, where it is *supposed* to mean eternal duration."

There is nothing in the above extracts by which we can gather the positive belief of this writer, nor is there in the letter, from which the extracts are taken ; though it must be acknowledged there is very much to make the reader believe, the writer does not hold to the eternity of future punishment.

W.

Providence, R. I.

FOR THE INQUIRER.

Of the explication of the Scriptures.

[Continued from page 21.]

In my first number, I endeavored, to exhibit a concise view of the *means*, which have, and do at this time exist, in the christian world, for explaining the scriptures, and furnishing the people with religious instruction. Although the view taken of this subject was too brief to exhibit in a very conspicuous light the amplitude, extent and diversity of the means referred to, yet we think it was sufficient to excite surprise if not astonishment in the minds of those, who had not previously reflected upon the subject. On contemplating this vast system of scientific and professional exertion, founded upon the Bible, the object of which is to unfold and enforce the truths of divine testimony, to render the scriptures plain and intelligible, and thereby to make mankind better citizens and better christians, the mind is naturally led to inquire whether there is any *necessity* for these extraordinary literary and professional efforts, and if there is, from what causes it arises ?

Will it be contended that it was a part of the design and plan of God, in making a revelation of his will to his creatures, that this revelation, should require the aid of a large portion of human science, and the labours, the learning and the ingenuity of a numerous profession to render it efficacious ? Was it a part of the divine scheme that the priesthood should be appended to revelation as God's interpreters, without whom it would be entirely useless ? Was it the design of God, in communicating the scriptures, that a knowledge of them could not be obtained, without the aid and explanations of commentators, critics, professors, doctors of divinity, theological seminaries, councils, synods and creed-makers ? Did infinite wisdom when making a communication of divine truth, to simple and short sighted mortals, and upon the un-

derstanding and observance of which their eternal felicity depends, present them, in *enigmas dark-riddle and unintelligible sayings* ? If such were the designs of God in giving us a revelation, I ask why did not these designs form a part of that revelation ? Why are we not informed in the sacred volume, that its divine truths, were locked up in hidden mysteries and dark sayings, that the ignorant and simple should not pervert them to their own destruction ; and that revelation *in and of itself* could neither be understood or be of any use, to those for whom it was intended—that it required to be interpreted, explained, unriddled, spiritualized, systems of faith formed from it, points of doctrine settled, dogmas established, creeds made, orthodoxy prescribed, the efficacy of faith defined, the limits and operation of grace explained, the merit of works determined ; its obscurities rendered intelligible, difficulties removed and apparent inconsistencies reconciled—by the learning, exertions and ingenuity of the clergy, commentators, critics, creed-makers, associations, assemblies, synods and councils.

If revelation is so obscure and unintelligible that it cannot be understood, it is evident that it must have been the design of God that it should be so, at the time it was communicated : for to deny this would be to contend that the Almighty in making a communication of his will, to his creatures, has not been able to do it in an intelligible manner, and so, that it could be understood by them, without its being explained and illucidated by those who are the self-styled interpreters of God's revealed will.

Ambiguity and obscurity in the writings of uninspired men, are often the subjects of just and severe criticism ; which, necessarily contains a charge against the writer, either that he does not understand the subject himself, or that from hurry, carelessness and inattention he has expressed himself in an unintelligible and confused manner. Any publication, which is subject to a serious objection of this kind, is universally condemned both by the learned and the unlearned ; and certainly very justly, as the only object of any writing is to communicate the ideas of the writer, and when this is not done intelligibly, it is not done at all. If a writer expresses himself in so ambiguous and unintelligible a manner, that one reader understands him in one way, another in another way and a third different from both, it is evident that such a work can be of no use ; he will have entirely failed in his object, not having made himself understood, and his work can only produce confusion and dissention. Such a writer would be considered as a great *bungler*. Will any one therefore presume to make such a charge against God, by maintaining that the scriptures are so mysterious, that they cannot be understood, without the aid of God's interpreters, and not admit that this was the intention of God ? We think not, as it would be the highest blasphemy.

If then the scriptures cannot be dark and unin-

telligible without its having been the design of God that they should be so, we again ask why this was not communicated? If it was a part of the design of the Almighty in making a communication of his will to mankind that it should be wrapped up in mysteries and dark sayings, to hide its divine truths from the eyes of the vulgar, and that all the literary and professional means and exertions to which we have referred, should be necessary to interpret it, why was not this disclosed?

It must appear very extraordinary that a Being infinitely wise and good, should make an unintelligible revelation; or a kind of half revelation, which requires to be interpreted or revealed the second time; but it is still more extraordinary that if such was the divine scheme, his creatures for whose benefit it was intended should not have been informed of it. But instead of this, we are told the contrary. The scriptures are declared to be, the scriptures of truth, the word of God, of light and life, and to be so plain that those who run may read. They are said to be communicated to the whole world, and for the whole world, but if they are not in a situation to be understood by all, how can they be said to be communicated to all? Christ tells us expressly to *search* the scriptures, 'for in them ye think ye have eternal life,' and asks the Jews why they did not 'judge for themselves' of these things. It appears therefore that instead of the scriptures containing any intimation, that the divine truths of revelation are enveloped in a cloud of mystery, they contain a language directly the reverse. It would be a mockery to require us to search the scriptures for eternal life, if they were locked up in an unknown tongue, or veiled in unintelligible mysteries. To say that God has given to the world a mysterious revelation, is little short of a contradiction in terms; but to say that he has done this, and that instead of presenting it in this light, he has represented it as plain and simple, and commanded us to search into it, to believe it, and to judge for ourselves concerning it, would be to charge God with deception, and falsehood.

In what a strange light does this exhibit the character of the Supreme Being. To command his creatures to search the scriptures, when he has for wise purposes rendered them unintelligible, and to believe, what he knows they cannot understand, would be a perfect mockery; but to affix a penalty or punishment, to a disbelief, and non-observance of that which they cannot comprehend, would be the greatest injustice and cruelty. It has justly been considered as one of the basest acts of capricious tyranny and cruelty, of Caligula, his having as we are informed by Dio Cassus, written his laws in a very small character and hung them upon high pillars the more effectually to ensnare the people. What would be thought of a legislator at the present day who should intentionally write his laws in an ambiguous and unintelligible manner? Would he not be execrated?

and having done this, would it not be considered as adding insult to injustice, was he to represent them as plain and simple, and command those for whom they were intended to search into them and observe them, when he had intentionally written them in so obscure a manner that he well knew they could not understand a word of them?

TRENCHARD.

Religious Inquirer.

HARTFORD, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1821.

MORE GOOD NEWS.

A new association of Universalists, was formed in Sept. last, in Palmyra, Portage County, Ohio—to be known by the name of the **NORTHERN OHIO UNIVERSALIAN ASSOCIATION**, at which time *eleven Churches, and sixteen Societies* were received into fellowship—and twenty-two representatives from different places where no regular societies have yet been formed, were admitted to a seat in the Association. Thus does the desert rejoice, and blossom as the rose.

"Try the *SPIRITS* whether they be of God."

The following is a specimen of the spirit, possessed by the famous **JOHN CALVIN**, the founder and father of that sect, called Calvinists. Believing that many are unacquainted with the spirit and character of that great REFORMER, we present the following items of his *pious* and *religious* feelings, for their information.

The following letter was written by **JOHN CALVIN**, Sept. 30, 1561, to the high CHAMBERLAIN of the king of Navarre.

"Honor, glory, and riches, shall be the reward of your pains; but above all do not fail to rid the country of those zealous scoundrels, who stir up the people to revolt against us. Such monsters should be exterminated, as *I have exterminated Michael Servetus the Spaniard.*"

Eccles. Researches London, p. 348.

Servetus was burnt at the stake, at the instigation of **CALVIN**. **CASTELLIO** a man celebrated for his learning and piety, having differed from **CALVIN** as to predestination, and free grace, Calvin prohibited the reading of his books, and endeavored to excite the civil magistrates to put him to death. **JEROME BOLSEC**, a preacher of the reformed religion, was banished from Geneva by Calvin's counsel, and forbid to return under pain of being whipped, for holding opinions similar to Castellio. In Italy, Calvin and his associates procured the execution of **VALENTINUS GENTILIS**, who entertained the principles of Arius.—He was beheaded in September, 1576.

This brethren was the *SPIRIT*, which governed that celebrated reformer—A spirit which has lived in the bosom of too many of his followers. If this spirit be of God, follow it; if not, we exhort you, to disown it, both in faith and practice.

"Be not weary in well doing."

We feel much gratified to find, that the few remarks made in the INQUIRER, on the doctrine of particular ELECTION and reprobation, have had a very salutary effect, and that some who have heretofore been thought, to have acknowledged a belief in the famous Saybrook platform, have come forward and fully denied their belief in the doctrine of election and reprobation. Perhaps we go too far in saying, that some have denied their belief in that sentiment. They have only declared, they have never preached that doctrine. Well, be it so; still we consider it as amounting to the same thing. When a man does not preach a particular doctrine, one of two things is certain.—Either he does not believe it, or he does not consider it of sufficient importance to trouble himself, or his hearers about it; for we can hardly believe that a pious and a good man, who professes to be a lover of souls, and has the good cause of religion at heart, would, for the sake of popularity, or the emoluments of place—tamper with the important concerns of eternity, and keep back a point of doctrine essential to the eternal happiness of mankind.

We have long been of the opinion, that but few of those, who have acknowledged a belief in the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation, really believed it—and that very few in the ministry were willing to preach it, being generally disposed to feed their hearers with Arminian bread. It may however be well to notice that if the doctrine of election is given up, TOTAL DEPRAVITY, and some other points equally absurd must go with it.

Having been so successful, we shall continue our remarks, on this heart chilling, and God dishonoring doctrine, until many more shall be willing to renounce it in all its parts; and having overturned the mighty FABRIC erected by John Calvin, and amended or improved by Hopkins and others, and brought the minds of our fellow men to act and think for themselves, it will be no hard matter to FAN out the chaff of Arminianism, free the human mind from the iron yoke of bondage that has been laid upon it—and enable men to stand fast in the LIBERTY wherewith Christ hath made them free.

Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. Tho' we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel—let him be accursed.

Mr. Editor,

Without presuming to judge any one (leaving that for the day of judgement and perdition of ungodly men) I must confess that after reading the two first numbers of your paper I could hardly help condemning the doctrine you advocate, (viz.) "Universal Salvation." The reason why I dis-

like this doctrine is, I do not believe it to be true; (I do not believe that the "broad way," and the "narrow path," both lead to heaven,) and the reason why I do not believe it to be true is, I do not believe it to be the same doctrine Jesus Christ preached; and the reason why I do not believe it to be the doctrine he preached is, it does not have the same effect upon those who hear it—"Who then can be saved!" was an exclamation of some who heard Christ preach. Now sir, why is it that your preaching never alarms those who sit under it—never causes them to conclude that there is any difficulty in getting to heaven? But perhaps you will not admit, but that some of your hearers, have, at times, been "pricked in their hearts," and tho' not made to "cry out" in public, "who then can be saved," or "what shall I do to be saved," have come to you "privately" to inquire, if there were but few to be saved? If this has ever been the case, will you be so good, dear sir, as to inform me what answer you gave them? for by comparing it with the answer of Christ to a similar question, I might determine and the public might also determine, whether you preach as Jesus Christ did, which at present is by no means believed to be the case by, ONE.

REPLY.

Our friend introduces his letter with quotations from scripture, and as he informs us, that he disbelieves the doctrine which we advocate, as not being that, which Christ preached; but has not told us how, or what Christ did preach, we are led to suppose, these quotations were designed to inform us, what the Gospel is, and the curse resting upon him that preaches any other. As our friend stumbles in the error, that thousands have done before him, it is necessary we inform him, that if he will carefully look at Mark, xvi. 15, 16. he will discover. First, a command to go and preach the gospel to every creature, and—Secondly, the consequence produced by that preaching; but not a word of gospel. If he doubts the truth of this assertion, let him look again.—Jesus says go preach; what? the gospel. What is the gospel? Again, "he that believeth, &c." Believeth—What? The gospel. Now let "ONE," tell us honestly if there is any thing of gospel in these two verses. No, certainly not. We must look elsewhere to find what is to be understood by the GOSPEL which they are to preach, the belief of which is salvation.

The word GOSPEL signifies GLAD TIDINGS, God's saying, or good saying—GOOD NEWS—Glad tidings of great joy—Good tidings of good—It is called the Gospel of PEACE—Gospel of Salvation. With this definition of the word before us, let us look at the command "go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," (viz.)—Preach GLAD TIDINGS to every creature—GOOD NEWS to every creature—Peace to every creature—Salvation to every creature—"As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of

them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things"—Rom. x. 15.—Will friend "ONE" now be willing to apply his text from Gal. i. 8. "But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

In order that this important subject may be fully understood, we will examine that doctrine which St. Paul called the gospel. Gal. iii. 8. "and the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel to Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed"—in verse 16th "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." St. Peter informs us in what this blessing promised us in Christ consists. Acts, iii. 25, 26, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant God made with our fathers, saying, unto Abraham, and in thy seed, shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.—Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities." The Gospel then, is comprised in this divine promise. In CHRIST shall all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth be blessed, being turned every one from his iniquities. This is glad tidings of great joy—it is good news—it is good tidings of good—and agrees with the divine testimony "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Again we ask, if friend "ONE" is willing to apply his text. "Tho' we, or an Angel from heaven, preach any other gospel—let him be accursed."

Our friend says, he cannot believe, that the doctrine we advocate is true, because he does not believe "that the 'broad way' and the 'narrow path' both, lead to heaven." Neither do we believe, that they both lead to heaven, that is, to a state of things, in another world; and this we think, friend "ONE" must have seen if he had paid due attention to his BIBLE. He will not be persuaded that the words MANY and FEW are synonymous terms. If not, if he explains his "narrow path" to lead to another world, which few find, he must contradict, the most plain and unequivocal testimony of scripture. Let him compare the following with the idea of FEW being saved. Isaiah liii. 11, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify MANY; for he shall bear their iniquities," Rom. v. 15, "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one, MANY be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto MANY." The eighteenth verse, St. Paul changes the word MANY into ALL—"Therefore as by the offence of one, judgement came upon ALL men to condemnation: Even so

by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon ALL men, unto justification of life," 20th verse "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the righteousness of one shall many be made righteous." The words *all*, and *many*, appear to be synonymous terms. See also Revelations, v. 11 and 18.

"ONE," does not believe the doctrine we advocate to be of Christ, because it does not produce ALARM. We ask him how glad tidings, or good news can possibly create alarm, or how the gospel of peace, and salvation can terrify the mind, with the direful apprehension of eternal damnation. If sir, you will look with candour on the passage, from which you have selected your sentence, "Who then can be saved," you will find no possible intimations of alarm—but an expression of surprize or amazement, on the part of the disciples of Christ, who used the expression in question. The circumstance was as follows. A young man came to Christ, saying, "what good thing shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life." Jesus told him to keep the commandments. The young man answered, "All these have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet. Jesus then said unto him if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me. When the young man heard this he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions." Jesus said to his disciples, "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. When the disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, *Who then can be saved.*" It is a matter of surprize, my dear sir, to see how prone men are, to wrest the scriptures from their connection and meaning, to support their particular tenets.

I would seriously inquire of our friend, appealing to his good sense and experience, whether the christian world are acting on the principle, that a rich man cannot enter into a state of blessedness in another world? Have not professors of religion, (not even excepting the clergy) ever been grasping after riches, dignities, and honors? Has not the sick bed been surrounded, and the dying tormented, until they willed their property or a portion of it to the church, for the support of the ministry? Have not enormous sums been collected, from the hard earnings of the industrious poor, to support a large body of men, under the name of *Missionaries*? Are not many houses of worship made the resort of the fashionable, the rich and the popular? And are there, not more indications among the religious, of a love for these things, than a belief, that riches exclude a man from the joys of another world, will warrant? And we would ask our friend, whether he does not believe, that there are many, so attached to riches and honors, that they go away sorrowful as did the young man, being unwilling to enter into the joy of supporting, and defending the gospel of

the kingdom of God in which they believe, for fear they should lose a vote, or some little honor.

A word more with respect to ALARM. We direct our friend, to the conversion of Zaccheus the Eunuch, and Saul of Tarsus—and desire him to point out what alarm affected their minds—we discover none. If religion is to command an exercise of the mind; alarm, destroying the harmony of the intellectual powers, would unfit the mind altogether, for receiving instruction. When the shepherds showed signs of alarm at the appearance of the angel—they were encouraged to “*fear not*” when the apostles were alarmed at the appearance of Jesus, after his resurrection, he said “*be not afraid*.” It is our humble opinion, that alarm, or those excitements produced on the mind are of modern date, altogether inconsistent with the genuine principles of the gospel, and productive of evils, which we trust the good sense of an enlightened community will in due time prevent.

We would inform our friend, that we find very many serious minds, disposed to inquire of us, concerning the things of the kingdom of God. We direct them to the scriptures of divine truth, and tell them to place more dependence on them, than on the TRADITIONS of men. We tell them as Christ did the young man, “*keep the commandments*.” We tell them to believe in him whom God hath sent. “*Who hath given himself a ransom for ALL, to be testified in due time*,” and to induce them to obey, we persuade them that God is Love—that this Love was manifested, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins, in sending his son “*to be the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the WHOLE WORLD*.” And we exhort them to take refuge in the promise of Almighty God, confirmed by his OATH, and enjoy the HOPE which is as an anchor of the soul both SURE and STEADFAST.

The following is from a young man, lately converted to the Baptist sentiment, to a friend of his believing in Universal Salvation.

Berlin, Nov. 26, 1821.

Dear Sir—

I take this opportunity, to write a few lines to you, concerning the welfare of your never dying soul; as I have once travelled the same road with you, believing it was right, as firmly as you do. I hope and trust that God has shown me the error of my ways, and it grieves me to think that you, or any one else, should walk the broad road any longer. Depend upon it, I was as unwilling to give up my principle as you are; but compelled by the power of God, I must say that there is a reality in religion, which I once disbelieved. I hope sir, you will feel the necessity of attending to it before it is too late. I wish you would read the second chapter of the 2d of Peter, and see

what that says. I think that points out the very road that you and I have too long travelled.

Yours with respect,

The above letter was handed to us for publication, with a request, that we should add a few observations by way of reply. This we would not have assented to, were it not, that such kind of conversions, as the writer met with, are spread abroad from town to town, and the WONDERFUL conversion of an Universalist, sounded through community—and as we have known instances in REVIVALS in towns where Universalism has prevailed, of questions being asked in such form, as to draw the conclusion from the answers, that the convert had been a believer in that sentiment, but has been converted and turned from it by the Almighty power of God, and that now he beholds it a *fatal delusion* and a *dangerous error*, and knowing the ART used to delude the less informed part of community, we have consented to answer the letter.

REPLY.

The writers mind is anxious about the never dying soul of his friend; if this anxiety is produced by the influence of that religion which is LOVE. Love being of God, who is the fountain from whence, all holy and benevolent affections flow, unless God has given to this convert, more LOVE than he has retained to himself, he must be as anxious for the welfare and salvation of the soul of our young friend as it is possible the writer of that letter can be, and we shall not go too far in saying that the writer would save his friend from all delusion and error if he had the power. Now God possesses the power; admit then he has as much love as the writer, and his friend is safe. It is a lamentable thing that people should be so blinded as to believe, that they have more anxiety, and love for the souls of men than God has.

The writer carries the idea, that he was a firm believer in Universalism, and was very unwilling to give up his principles until compelled by the power of God; then he discovered, there was a reality in religion which he did not believe before, (viz.) when he was a Universalist. Here the total ignorance of this dear young man shows itself; he never knew any thing of the system of Universal salvation, whatever he may have pretended, for that sentiment is predicated on the UNIVERSAL BENEVOLENCE and goodness of GOD.—It requires men to love God with all the heart, it teaches them to love their neighbors as themselves, to be kind, friendly, and charitable, to avoid the evil, and choose that which is good. As far then as he yielded obedience to these sentiments he was a Universalist, and no farther; now we ask him, is there no REALITY in religion like this? If he has a different religion produced by the Almighty power of God, we should like to know what it is, in which there is such a divine reality.

The writer refers his friend to the second Pe-

ter 2d chapter. We know not what particular part of the chapter he aimed at. Our limits will not admit of our noticing the whole, perhaps he referred to false teachers.—If he will read carefully he will find that those false teachers denied the Lord that bought them. These then cannot be Universalists—for they acknowledge, that Jesus has given himself a ransom for all, and that all mankind are the purchased possession. We would ask him if he has not been deceived by this DAMNABLE HERESY, and denied the Lord that bought him? We would direct him particularly to notice the 13th verse and onward to the end of the chapter; and if he has ever known any thing of the truth, or enjoyed the liberty of the gospel, to inquire seriously whether his case is not pointed out in these verses. And we cordially and affectionately beseech and exhort him to return to his redeemer, and acknowledge the Lord that bought him, and all mankind.

Chaplain.—It is with much satisfaction we announce, that the Rev. JARED SPARKS, pastor of the first Independent or Unitarian Church at Baltimore, has been chosen Chaplain to the House of Representatives. The appointment appears to have been warmly contested, a choice not having been made until the fourth ballot. This appointment, certainly cannot but be regarded as a triumph of liberal principles. We ask those who deny Unitarians the name of *Christians*, to look at it. Are the representatives of the nation, to be stigmatized, and denied the name of Christians, because their minds are not confined within the narrow limits of Calvinistic prejudices and Trinitarian dogmas? The friends of liberality and free inquiry, have occasion to rejoice and take courage, when rational and enlightened views of christianity are sanctioned by the Representatives of the nation. Mr. Sparks, we understand is a clergyman of distinguished talents and extensive erudition, and a real ornament to his profession.

In the Albany Register, of Dec. 12th inst. we observe with pleasure, notice of a SERMON to be delivered that evening in the CAPITOL, accompanied with a request for all believers in the restoration of all things to attend, "It being desirable that a society should be formed by those who believe in the Gospel preached to Abraham." We bid them God-speed—and pray that the blessing of the God of Abraham may rest upon them, and succeed them in their labors, to free the human mind from worse than Egyptian darkness, superstition and bigotry.

DEDICATION AND ORDINATION.

On Wednesday, Nov. 14th, the new Universalist Meeting-house in Brookfield, (Mass.) was formally dedicated to the worship of God. Rev. John Bisbe was ordained, in the afternoon of the same day, to the pastoral care of the Universalist Societies of Brookfield and Western.

[*Boston Universalist Magazine.*]

WHAT DO YOU THINK.

"Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, &c. unto Him be glory, &c. Eph. iii. 20. Reader, how much can you ask and think? Can you ask for the happiness of all men in heaven? Can you think that it is possible for God to save all men from their sins, [not in them,] and make them happy? God "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all this." What do you think? Will He do it?

When the apostle says, that "God is able to do," etc. does he mean that "God cannot" except man will condescend to let him? What do you think? We think, that God's goodness is equal to his power, and His wisdom is equal to his goodness, and that He will do all that He has promised? What do you think? [Ib.]

How can "Christ be the Saviour of all men," without all men are saved by him?—*Gospel Herald.*

FOR THE INQUIRER.

ORIGINAL ANECDOTE.

Some few years since, a HERALD of that gospel which brings "glad tidings of great joy to all people," preached in a certain town in this state, to a large and respectable congregation, and set forth the love of God, manifested in the salvation of all men, much to the satisfaction of the greater part of his hearers. There were some however, who believed, or pretended to believe, that such doctrine was very dangerous, tending to licentiousness; and of this number was a deacon F. a firm believer in predestination, total depravity, and special election—these were very uneasy on the occasion, and as soon as Mr. S. the preacher had dismissed the meeting, gathered around him, and without much introduction or ceremony, began to upbraid him for preaching such doctrine. Mr. S. says the deacon, "if I believed what you preach, I should as leave *LIE, MURDER, STEAL, ROB, CHEAT, or DEFAUD* my neighbor as not; in short I would not be afraid to do any thing however bad." Stop says Mr. S. "deacon F. you are not so bad a man, as you would represent yourself; I know your weak head betrays you; do you not earnestly wish for the happiness of all; and if it were in your power, would you not make every man happy?" Why yes, says the deacon. "Well," continues Mr. S. "do you not pray that all men may be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth; and if you possessed the power, would you let one soul be damned to all eternity." "Oh by no means" says the deacon, "I would be willing to spend all my days on my knees in prayer, if I could prevent one soul from being lost." Then says Mr. S. "what a pity it is you do not believe, that God who is infinite in wisdom and power, and whose nature is LOVE, has as good a disposition as you have; do you think he has less love for mankind than yourself." HEM—HEM says the deacon, "I must go, for I am afraid you will make a Universalist of me, before I know it."

MAXIM.

Piety and peace go hand in hand; but piety and discord have no connection: where the latter prevails it destroys the former.

MARRIED.

In this City on the 11th inst. by the Rev. Mr. Carrique, Mr. Joseph Robinson, of Hardwick, Mass. to Miss Ann Maria Ruggles.

On the 12th inst. in Christ's Church, by the Rev. Mr. Wheaton, Mr. James Canfield, to Miss Clarissa Collins.

On the 13th inst. by the Rev. Dr. Flint, Mr. Willis Root, of Vernon, to Miss Hannah Collins.

DIED.

In this City, on the 3th inst. Miss Sarah Russ, aged 10, daughter of the Hon. John Russ.

At Augusta, Ga. Mrs. Sally Wheeler, wife of Capt. Joseph Wheeler, late of this City.

In Providence, R. I. on Sunday the 9th inst. Mr. Henry Waterman, aged 31 years. He possessed a heart without guile, affectionate and benevolent, a mind directed by the principles of truth and honor; his many virtues founded on these and in a firm belief of the universal love and goodness of his Heavenly Father, gained him the love and esteem of all who knew him. Thus cut off in early life, he has left his relatives and friends to mourn the loss of a dutiful son, an affectionate brother, a kind husband and parent and a firm friend, and the public, one of its worthiest citizens.

[*Patriot.*]

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, AT \$1 PER ANN. IN ADVANCE, A FEW RODS SOUTH OF THE LITTLE BRIDGE.

FOR SALE,

A few Pamphlets on different subjects—Also a few of Mr. BAILLOT'S Catechism's.